

July 12, 1965

ized to reserve in the Treasury of the United States a part of such funds sufficient, in his judgment, to meet the litigation expenses, exclusive of attorney fees, of the remaining cases which each has pending before the Indian Claims Commission.

(b) The funds reserved shall be available for appropriate withdrawal by the Secretary.

Sec. 10. The funds distributed under the provisions of this Act shall not be subject to Federal or State income taxes, and any costs incurred by the Secretary in the preparation of the rolls and in the distribution of per capita shares in accordance with the provisions of this Act shall be paid by appropriate withdrawals from the judgment funds.

Sec. 11. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the provisions of this Act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

(Mr. HALEY asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, from time to time Congress has bills similar to H.R. 7466. This provides for the distribution of judgment funds among Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma. I believe such bills should be expedited for at least two reasons. First, the Indians ought to get use of the money as soon as possible, and, second, the money, deposited in the U.S. Treasury, is drawing 4 percent interest, a cost to the United States.

The Indian Claims Commission awarded four judgments to the Miami Indians of Oklahoma and Indiana. Both groups share in two of them; while each share individually in the other two. A total amount of \$5,061,400 is involved. The usual 10-percent litigation and attorney fees has been paid and the remaining amounts is in the U.S. Treasury.

The Miami Tribe of Indians is unorganized so its share will be distributed per capita-wise. Although the Miamis of Oklahoma are organized under the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934 they have no tribal land so it is expected that they, too, will receive per capita payments.

Since the tribes have other dockets pending in the Indian Claims Commission, provision is made in H.R. 7466 for reservation of funds sufficient to meet the expenses of litigation in other cases which are being prosecuted. The bill also provides for the exemption from Federal and State income taxes of any money distributed per capita and also protects payments which will be made to minors or those under other legal disabilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the enactment of H.R. 7466.

TO AMEND JOINT RESOLUTION OF MARCH 25, 1953

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 481) to amend the joint resolution of March 25, 1953, to expand the types of equipment and the number of electric typewriters furnished Members of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the author of the bill or the gentleman handling the bill if there is any estimate of the cost of each additional piece of equipment that it is proposed to provide each Member.

Mr. Speaker, in the absence of either the chairman of the Subcommittee on House Administration or the author of the bill from the floor, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

SOUTH PACIFIC COMMISSION

The Clerk called the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 503) to amend the joint resolution of January 28, 1948, relating to membership and participation by the United States in the South Pacific Commission, so as to authorize certain appropriations thereunder for the fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Anticipated File

ANTIRELIGIOUS ACTIVITIES IN THE SOVIET UNION AND IN EASTERN EUROPE

The Clerk called the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 17) expressing the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by the Soviet Union because of their religion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that this resolution from the Committee on Foreign Affairs does not differentiate between the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the other European countries in its intent.

Furthermore, I notice that the State Department has a letter of opposition to it as a blanket indictment of East European countries without regard to the changes that have occurred since World War II between the Soviet Union and other European countries.

Finally, I notice that the committee has not seen fit to include the State Department's suggested amendment. Ordinarily this would impel me to favor the bill, but I wonder if there is some explanation.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I am delighted to yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of your Committee on Foreign Affairs, which brought this resolution out, I am delighted to have the opportunity to say a few words about it.

This resolution came from the other

body, which did not hold any hearings on it. At the request of many of our colleagues in the House and other persons interested in the resolution to which the gentleman has referred, we held hearings for 3 days and received testimony from some 50 witnesses. We heard testimony from representatives of the Jewish community and those of various religious groups. As a result of those hearings, we came up with some new language which is included in the present resolution. I should like to stress, however, that the version unanimously approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs contains all the items which were embodied in the "whereas" clauses of the original Senate-approved resolution.

Now with regard to the questions posed by the gentleman from Missouri, we came to the conclusion that no religion is really being tolerated either in the Soviet Union or in the Eastern European countries.

We also discovered that infringements on religious freedom, and persecution of religious groups, differ from country to country in that area of the world. We brought that out in the resolution and in our report—particularly as far as the eastern European countries are concerned. This differentiation is very clearly spelled out in the text of the resolution and in the supporting documents. Further, we devoted one "whereas" clause specifically to the plight of the Soviet Jewry, thereby emphasizing the fact that the persecution of the Jewish faith and of the Jewish culture in the Soviet Union finds no parallel at present in eastern Europe.

Mr. Speaker, I should also like to say that we bypassed the suggestions of the State Department regarding eastern Europe because the record clearly shows that infringements on religious freedom continues in many of those countries. However, we pointed out in the resolution that this situation, these conditions, exist in varying degrees in the different countries of eastern Europe. These are the facts and I can not see why the Department of State should—if would—object to our action in outlining them. But even so, had the Department continued to object, that would not have persuaded me to change my position. The fact that the Committee on Foreign Affairs approved the resolution unanimously also speaks for itself.

Does that answer the gentleman's question?

Mr. HALL. If I understand the gentlewoman correctly, the State Department will not now oppose the resolution as rewritten, even though it does lump other eastern European countries and satellites of the U.S.S.R. together? Is that the import of the gentlewoman's statement?

Mrs. KELLY. I would be inclined to believe that this is the case because the Committee on Foreign Affairs did not condemn any country of eastern Europe by name and included the phrase, "in varying degrees" when referring to the persecution of religious groups in that area.

July 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15749

claims case by the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska. After about 10 years, the Tlingits and Haidas organized and retained an attorney and filed the case. In 1959, the court decided that the United States owed these tribes money because establishment of the Tongas National Forest had done away with their historical native rights to the land within that forest, which covers most of southeast Alaska. The court said it would go ahead further with the case to decide how much the Government owed. This decision has not yet been made, but is expected in a year or so.

For you to understand the picture, I must tell you more about the 1935 jurisdictional act. It provided that, if the Court of Claims gave a judgment for the Tlingits and Haidas, the money would have to be programmed for village projects and scholarships for students and other community purposes, with nothing allotted to individual members of the tribes—in other words, with nothing allotted on a per capita basis.

Accordingly, new legislation is necessary to allow for per capita distribution, which is advisable because so many Tlingits and Haidas are now scattered and no longer living in their original villages. The new legislation, now before us, in its amended form after having passed the Senate, would allow for per capita distribution—in whole or in part—of the money which will be forthcoming. If, for instance, one-half of the money were to be distributed—share and share alike—to the individual members of the Tlingit and Haida groups, the other one-half would be programmed for community purposes.

The bill now pending, as amended, does not say what portion of the money will be distributed on a per capita basis and what portion will be used for community purposes. It says that, when the time comes, the Congress will pass another act making that decision. It also says that, in the meantime, a register of all Tlingits and Haidas shall be prepared by the Secretary of the Interior and a representative central council elected by 18 communities of these Indians, which shall meet and prepare recommendations for submission to the Congress declaring the wishes of the Tlingits and Haidas as to what portion should be distributed to individual members of these groups and what portion, if any, should be earmarked for community or village purposes. Thereafter, as it should be, the Congress would make this decision. This legislation is a necessary step in the right direction, so I urge passage of this bill.

FUNDS OF THE MIAMI INDIANS OF INDIANA AND OKLAHOMA

The Clerk called the bill H.R. 7466, to provide for the disposition of funds appropriated to pay judgments in favor of the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

MR. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a question I want to ask of the subcommittee chair-

man with regard to this bill. Section 4 of the bill under consideration mentions the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and appropriated by the act of May 17, 1963. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if it is his understanding that docket No. 67 is consolidated with docket No. 124 and that the reference to docket No. 67 in the appropriation bill is a reference to both dockets Nos. 67 and 124?

MR. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

MR. ROUSH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

MIAMI TRIBE

MR. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, in response to the question asked by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Roush], I want to say this: H.R. 7466 refers to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets Nos. 67 and 124 and to the funds appropriated by the act of May 17, 1963, to satisfy that judgment. The act of May 17, 1963, in turn, refers to House document No. 90 of the 88th Congress. In that document, which listed all judgments for which appropriations were being sought, reference is made to docket No. 67. The amount set beside this reference, however, is exactly the same as the amount for which judgment was entered in consolidated dockets Nos. 67 and 124—namely, \$4,647,500 plus or minus a few dollars. So I think we may safely say that an appropriation has been made to satisfy the judgment in both these dockets, consolidated as they were, notwithstanding the fact that the reference in House Document No. 90 is to only one of them by number.

MR. ROUSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior shall take the necessary steps to provide for the distribution and use of the money appropriated to the Miami Indians of Indiana and Oklahoma in satisfaction of judgments awarded by the Indian Claims Commission in dockets numbered 67 and 124, 124-A, and 251 as hereinafter provided.

Sec. 2. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment by the Indian Claims Commission in docket numbered 251, together with the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be advanced or expended in accordance with plans adopted by the governing body of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma and approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The persons entitled to share in any per capita payment authorized by the governing body and approved by the Secretary shall be all individuals who are enrolled members of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, as organized under the Oklahoma Welfare Act (49 Stat. 1967).

Sec. 3. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124-A to the Miami Indians of Indiana and appropriated by the Act of September 30,

1961 (75 Stat. 747), the Secretary shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

(a) They were born on or prior to, and living on, the date of this Act; and

(b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on the roll of Miami Indians of Indiana of June 12, 1895, or the roll of "Miami Indians of Indiana, now living in Kansas, Quapaw Agency, I.T., and Oklahoma Territory," prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 2, 1895 (28 Stat. 903), or the roll of the Eel River Miami Tribe of Indians of May 27, 1889, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of June 29, 1888 (25 Stat. 223). No person whose name appears on the current tribal roll of the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma shall be eligible to be enrolled under this section.

Sec. 4. For the purpose of determining entitlement to the judgment awarded in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124 and appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), the Secretary of the Interior shall prepare a roll of all persons of Miami Indian ancestry who meet the following requirements for eligibility:

(a) They were born on or prior to, and living on, the date of this Act; and

(b) Their name or the name of an ancestor from whom they claim eligibility appears on any of the rolls cited in section 3(b) of this Act, or on the roll of the Western Miami Tribe of Indians of June 12, 1891, prepared and completed pursuant to the Act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stat. 1000).

Sec. 5. Applications for enrollment must be filed with the area director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Muskogee, Oklahoma, on forms prescribed for that purpose. The determination of the Secretary regarding the eligibility of an applicant shall be final.

Sec. 6. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Miami Indians of Indiana that were appropriated by the Act of September 30, 1961 (75 Stat. 747), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission docket numbered 124-A, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the individuals whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 3, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

Sec. 7. The funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the "Miami Tribe of Oklahoma" that were appropriated by the Act of May 17, 1963 (77 Stat. 43), to pay a judgment in Indian Claims Commission dockets numbered 67 and 124, and the interest thereon, after payment of attorney fees and expenses, shall be distributed to the persons whose names appear on the roll prepared pursuant to section 4, and in accordance with the instructions contained in sections 8 and 9, of this Act.

Sec. 8. (a) Except as provided in subsection (b) of this section, the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a living enrollee directly to such enrollee, and the Secretary shall distribute a per capita share payable to a deceased enrollee directly to his heirs or legatees upon proof of death and inheritance satisfactory to the Secretary, whose findings upon such proof shall be final and conclusive.

(b) A share payable to a person under twenty-one years of age or to a person under legal disability shall be paid in accordance with such procedures as the Secretary determines will adequately protect the best interests of such persons.

Sec. 9. (a) Prior to making any distribution of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe or Nation and the Miami Tribe of Indiana or approving any expenditures of the funds credited to the Miami Tribe of Oklahoma, pursuant to this Act, the Secretary is author-

July 12, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

15751

Mr. HALL. I would like to ask the subcommittee chairman, the gentlewoman from New York, does she feel that the low countries, for example, or France, or the countries of the European Common Market, in the phraseology of the resolution, might be confused with the so-called satellite Communist countries or Communist Russia itself?

Mrs. KELLY. If I understand the gentleman correctly, I do not see why the western European countries should be involved in this particular issue. We are talking here about eastern Europe—even though religious persecution is of concern to us no matter where it occurs.

Mr. HALL. Certainly, all would concur that we are interested primarily in the freedom of all religions, and I find not one whit of evidence against that. But my question is simply a question of blanket indictment by name of all eastern European countries by virtue of the fact that the resolution includes them without any differentiation from the U.S.S.R.

Mrs. KELLY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALL. I would be delighted to yield further.

Mrs. KELLY. I would like to repeat that the resolution concerns itself solely with the Soviet Union and with eastern Europe, and that it does not include the western European nations. Further, we do differentiate between the Soviet Union and the countries of eastern Europe in the matter of religious persecution.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentlewoman from New York consider that Russia itself, with its provinces, lies in western Europe?

Mrs. KELLY. I beg the gentleman's pardon?

Mr. HALL. Does the gentlewoman consider that Russia itself lies in eastern Europe rather than in western Europe?

Mrs. KELLY. Yes, it certainly does, even though a large portion of its territory is located in Asia.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to recapitulate what action was taken by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and what is involved in the resolution before the House.

As I already mentioned, the Subcommittee on Europe held 3 days of hearings on the subject dealt with in the resolution. In the course of these hearings we received testimony from over 50 witnesses, including Members of Congress and representatives of various religious groups.

Some of those witnesses have traveled to or lived in the Soviet Union or in Eastern Europe and were in a position to give us a firsthand account of the status of various religions in those countries.

Having carefully considered the record of the testimony presented during the hearings—a record which is available to every Member of this House—two conclusions emerged:

First. That no religion is at home in the Soviet Union or in the countries of Eastern Europe. In spite of their ostensible adherence to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights—in spite

of their respective constitutions which guarantee their own citizens freedom of conscience and of religion—the Governments of the Soviet Union and of other Eastern European countries persistently infringe on those rights.

The degree of religious persecution differs from country to country in the area embraced by this resolution. It also differs with respect to different religions, and even individual adherents to a given religion.

This fact is brought out clearly in the resolution.

Second. We concluded, as a result of our hearings, that the Soviet Union stands alone in the degree of anti-Semitism practiced within its territory.

Our hearings, and the report which accompanies the resolution, detail the various forms of Soviet anti-Semitism. In many respects the treatment of Jews in the Soviet Union represents a conscious effort on the part of the Soviet Government to suppress and to do away with the Soviet Jewry as an ethnic, cultural, and religious entity.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention in closing that the resolution calls upon the Soviet Union and those Governments of Eastern Europe which continue to infringe on the religious freedom of their citizens, to cease these practices and to allow their citizens their constitutionally guaranteed rights to freedom of worship.

I sincerely hope that the resolution will meet with unanimous support in the House.

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentlewoman from New York, and the chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. Speaker. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the Senate concurrent resolution?

There was no objection.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 17

Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union is persecuting, in varying degrees of intensity, elements of its Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens; and

Whereas there is also abundant evidence that Jewish citizens have been singled out for extreme punishment for alleged economic offenses, by confiscating synagogues, by closing Jewish cemeteries, by arresting rabbis and lay religious leaders, by curtailing religious observances, by discriminating against Jews in cultural activities and access to higher education, by imposing restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and by other acts that oppress Jews in the free exercise of their faith; and

Whereas the Soviet Union has a clear opportunity to match the words of its constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific actions so that the world may know whether there is a genuine hope for

a new day of better understanding among all people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that persecution of any person because of their religion by the Soviet Union be condemned, and that the Soviet Union in the name of decency and humanity be urged to cease executing persons for alleged economic offenses, and to permit fully the free exercise of religion and the pursuit of culture by Jews and all others within its borders.

With the following committee amendments:

Strike out all of the preamble and insert the following:

"Whereas the Congress of the United States deeply believes in freedom of religion for all people and is opposed to infringement of this freedom anywhere in the world; and

"Whereas the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the United Nations declares that everyone has the right to freedom of thought and religion and the right to manifest his religion or belief in public or in private through teaching, practice, worship, and observance; and

"Whereas articles 124 and 125 of the Constitution of the Soviet Union, and the existing constitutions of other Eastern European countries, guarantee their citizens freedom of conscience and religious worship; and

"Whereas abundant evidence has made clear that the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other countries of Eastern Europe are persecuting, in varying degrees of intensity, elements of their Christian, Jewish, and Muslim citizens and infringing upon their freedom of religion through confiscatory taxation and closing of religious institutions, deliberate suppression of religious education, interference with religious and related cultural practices, denial of regular contacts between religious bodies in their countries with similar bodies in other parts of the world, and through persistent discrimination against persons professing and practicing their religions by state, party, Communist youth, police, labor, and public organizations; and

"Whereas there is also abundant evidence that Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union are being singled out for extreme punishment for the free exercise of their faith through the closing of synagogues and cemeteries, curtailment of religious observances, discrimination in cultural activities and access to higher education, imposition of restrictions that prevent the reuniting of Jews with their families in other lands, and the arrest of rabbis and lay religious leaders; and

"Whereas the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries have a clear opportunity to match the words of their constitutional guarantees of freedom of religion with specific and appropriate actions: Now, therefore, be it".

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

"That it is the sense of the Congress that the persecution of any persons because of their religion by the Government of the Soviet Union and the governments of other Eastern European countries be condemned, and that such governments be urged to cease such persecution and to permit full and free exercise of religion and related cultural pursuits by all persons within their countries.

"Sec. 2. It is further the sense of the Congress that the attention of the United Nations should be drawn to this resolution and that the United Nations should continue in its efforts on behalf of freedom of religion."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

July 12, 1965

The Senate concurrent resolution, as amended, was concurred in.

The title was amended so as to read as follows: "Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Soviet Union and the Eastern European countries should be urged to permit the free exercise of religion."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION OF DECEASED DEPENDENTS OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3037) to amend section 1485 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of remains of deceased dependents of members of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3037

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) The catchline and subsection (a) of section 1485 are amended to read as follows:

"§ 1485. Dependents of members of armed forces

"(a) The Secretary concerned may, if a dependent of a member of an armed force dies while the member is on active duty (other than for training), provide for, and pay the necessary expenses of, transporting the remains of the deceased dependent to the home of the decedent or to any other place that the Secretary determines to be the appropriate place of interment."

(2) The analysis of chapter 75 is amended by striking out the following item:

"1485. Dependents of members of armed forces; death while outside the United States."

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

"1485. Dependents of members of armed forces."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETROCEDING TO THE STATE OF WISCONSIN CONCURRENT JURISDICTION OF AREAS WITHIN CAMP McCOY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 546) to retrocede to the State of Wisconsin concurrent jurisdiction over the rights-of-way for U.S. Highway 16 and Wisconsin State Highway No. 21 within Camp McCoy, Wis., and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 546

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby granted to the State of Wisconsin a retrocession of jurisdiction over

(1) such portions of the rights-of-way for United States Highway 16 and Wisconsin State Highway Numbered 21 as are located on real property within the exterior boundaries of Camp McCoy, Wisconsin; and

(2) such portion of the right-of-way for Interstate Highway I-90 as may be located on

real property within the exterior boundaries of Camp McCoy, Wisconsin.

This retrocession of jurisdiction is granted to the extent that all laws of the State of Wisconsin and of the United States shall be applicable with respect to the property covered by the retrocession, and the United States and the State shall exercise concurrent jurisdiction thereover.

Sec. 2. The retrocession of jurisdiction provided for by the first section of this Act shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike all language following the enactment clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Army may, at such times as he may deem desirable, relinquish to the State of Wisconsin all, or such portion as he may deem desirable for relinquishment, of the jurisdiction heretofore acquired by the United States over any land within the Camp McCoy Military Reservation, Monroe County, Wisconsin, reserving to the United States such concurrent or partial jurisdiction as he may deem necessary. Relinquishment of jurisdiction under the authority of this Act may be made by filing with the Governor of the State of Wisconsin a notice of such relinquishment, which shall take effect upon acceptance thereof by the State of Wisconsin in such manner as its laws may prescribe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended to read as follows: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to adjust the legislative jurisdiction exercised by the United States over lands within Camp McCoy Military Reservation, Wisconsin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING TRANSPORTATION AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE OF PRIVATELY OWNED MOTOR VEHICLES OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 8484) to amend section 2634 of title 10, United States Code, relating to the transportation of privately owned motor vehicles of members of the Armed Forces on a change of permanent station.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder if someone can tell me whether this is going to expand the authority for servicemen to ship automobiles overseas at Government expense?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, this would not affect the matter the gentleman has just referred to. This legislation became necessary because under existing law an automobile that has been sent overseas for a serviceman's use can only be sent back to the mainland from where it was shipped at Government expense.

We had the situation where a Marine division was sent from Hawaii to Vietnam, not back to the mainland. Their

families were sent back, but their automobiles could not be sent back at Government expense. It created a serious problem, and it has given them a great deal of difficulty.

Mr. GROSS. It does not expand on the authority of servicemen to take automobiles overseas?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 8484

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 157 of title 10, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) By amending section 2634 to read as follows:

"§ 2634. Motor vehicles; for members on change of permanent station

"(a) When a member of an armed force is ordered to make a change of permanent station, one motor vehicle owned by him and for his personal use or the use of his dependents may, unless a motor vehicle owned by him was transported in advance of that change of permanent station under section 406(h) of title 37, be transported, at the expense of the United States, to his new station or such other place as the Secretary concerned may authorize—

"(1) on a vessel owned, leased, or chartered by the United States;

"(2) by privately owned American shipping services; or

"(3) by foreign-flag shipping services if shipping services described in clauses (1) and (2) are not reasonably available.

When the Secretary concerned, or his designee, determines that a replacement for that motor vehicle is necessary for reasons beyond the control of the member and is in the interest of the United States, and he approves the transportation in advance, one additional motor vehicle of the member may be so transported.

"(b) In this section, 'change of permanent station' means the transfer or assignment of a member of the armed forces from one permanent station to another. It includes the change from home or from the place from which ordered to active duty to first station upon appointment, call to active duty, enlistment, or induction, and from last duty station to home or to the place from which ordered to active duty upon separation from the service, placement upon the temporary disability retired list, release from active duty, or retirement. It also includes an authorized change in home yard or home port of a vessel."

(2) By striking out of the analysis:

"2634. Motor vehicles: for members on permanent change of station."

and inserting in place thereof:

"2634. Motor vehicles: for members on change of permanent station."

Sec. 2. Section 406(h)(2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) authorize the transportation of one motor vehicle owned by the member and for his or his dependents' personal use to that location by means of transportation authorized under section 2634 of title 10."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 8, following line 14, add a new section 3 as follows:

"Sec. 3. This Act shall be effective May 1, 1965. Any member who—